

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended to improve form and provide improved correlation with the drawings and claims. Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 12, 13 and 18 have been amended. Claims 1-22 and 24-28 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

**The 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection:**

Claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,774,435 to Levinson. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "wherein the corrugated structure is arranged in a predetermined pitch." Although Levinson describes an inner surface of the transparent substrate 30 as a pattern of disruptions or undulations projecting upward, there is no mention that the undulations or disruptions have a "predetermined pitch," as recited in claim 1. Further, the interior surface of Levinson is described as "uneven and disordered," characteristics which are not compatible with "predetermined pitch" as recited in claim 1.

Claims 4, 10 and 11 are deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite "a corrugated structure having a predetermined pitch" Although Levinson describes an inner surface of the transparent substrate 30 as a pattern of disruptions or undulations projecting upward, there is no mention that the undulations or disruptions have a "predetermined pitch," as recited in claim 1..

Claims 19 and 20 are deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth above regarding claim 12.

Claim 24 recites that each identifiable geometric shape has a "first end integrally formed with the planar surface and a second end displaced from the planar surface by a predetermined distance and parallel with the planar surface." Levinson makes no mention of each disruption having "a second end displaced from the planar surface by a predetermined distance and parallel with the planar surface," as recited in claim 24.

**The First 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection:**

Claims 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,774,435 to Levinson as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,677,703 to Ito et al.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "a corrugated structure formed on the substrate, wherein the corrugated structure is arranged in a predetermined pitch and a first electrode layer, a first insulation layer, a fluorescent layer, a second insulation layer, and a second electrode layer sequentially formed on the substrate to follow a shape of the corrugated structure." Claim 2 recites "the corrugated structure comprises a plurality of dots, each dot having a cylindrical shape or a polygonal cone shape, and arranged in the predetermined pitch."

Ito et al. FIG. 2 shows a cover plate 10 having a plurality of projections 21 for use in a display device, however, Ito et al. teach away from using such a cover plate in direct contact with the a front surface of a display panel. At col. 14, lines 50-58, Ito et al. state:

"The display device 100 of the present invention is formed by disposing the display panel 30 behind the cover plate of the present invention. The front surface of the display panel 30 is spaced apart from the back surface of the cover plate 10 by a gap instead of being closely bonded to the back surface of the cover plate 10 with an adhesive, because the reflection-reducing ability of the minute irregularities 2 characteristic of the present invention is scarcely effective if the display panel 30 is bonded closely to the cover plate 10."

Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been motivated to combine Ito et al. with Levinson the substrate must be in close proximity with the light emitters.

Claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 25-28 are deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth above regarding claim 2.

**The Second 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection:**

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,774,435 to Levinson as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,443,487 to Yamazaki.

Claims 21 and 22 are deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth above regarding claim 12.

**Allowable Subject Matter:**

Claims 3, 9 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 3, 9 and 18 have been amended as set forth above to be independent claims and are thus deemed to be in condition for allowance.

**Conclusion:**

It is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered as the amendment at least places the claims in better form for appeal.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 8/18/06

By: John H. Stowe  
John H. Stowe  
Registration No. 32,863

1400 Eye St., NW  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510